Juot		1 1100 017 1072001 1 ago 1 01 10
1	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW TORK	
3		
4	IN RE:	. Case No. 04-16410 (CB-SMB)
5	KOLLEL MATEH EFRAIM, LLC,	<ul><li>New York, New York</li><li>Tuesday, May 22, 2007</li></ul>
6	Debtor.	. 10:50 a.m.
7		•
8	TD A NOCD I	DT OF MOTIONS
9	TRANSCRIPT OF MOTIONS BEFORE THE HONORABLE STUART M. BERNSTEIN	
10	CHIEF UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE	
11	APPEARANCES:	
12	For the Debtor:	Scott Krinsky, Esq. BACKENROTH, FRANKEL &
		KRINSKY, LLP
13 14		489 Fifth Avenue New York, New York 10017 (212) 593-1100
15	For Helen-May Holdings, LLC:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
16		LAW OFFICES OF DAVID CARLEBACH 40 Exchange Place
17		New York, New York 10005 (212) 785-3041
18		
19	Audio Operator:	Electronically Recorded
20		by Court Personnel
21	Transcription Company:	Rand Transcript Service, Inc. 80 Broad Street, Fifth Floor
22		New York, New York 10004 (212) 504-2919
23		www.randtranscript.com
24	Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.	
25		
	l	

```
(Proceedings commence at 10:50 a.m.)
1
             THE COURT: Okay. Kollel Mateh.
2
             MR. CARLEBACH: Good morning, Your Honor.
3
             THE COURT: Good morning.
4
            MR. CARLEBACH: David Carlebach, representing credit
5
   Helen-May Holdings.
6
             I guess the first thing we should address is the order
7
   to show cause.
8
             THE COURT:
                         Okav.
9
            MR. CARLEBACH: Debtor, in their response papers, have
10
   essentially consented to the prong of the motion seeking a
11
   lifting of the stay, which, I guess, is good news in a sense.
12
   But what we have put in our reply is that, you know, similar to
13
   the rejection of a lease, the Code provides for something
   called an immediately surrender of the premises to the
15
   landlord.
16
             I think that in this particular situation, it's
17
   analogous to that, and it's just absolutely vital. I mean,
18
   it's clear from the advertisement that I appended to -- and I
19
   asked the Court to trust my translation, which I will represent
20
   is ninety-eight percent accurate.
21
             THE COURT: What about the other two?
22
23
             MR. CARLEBACH: In other words, I'm just leaving --
   I'm leaving a two-percent margin for error, only because
   somebody --
25
```

THE COURT: Pretty confident, huh?

MR. CARLEBACH: What?

THE COURT: That's a lot of confidence.

MR. CARLEBACH: Yes. No, I -- and it's clear what the debtors' intention is. The debtors' intention -- they agreed to a lifting of the stay. To now engage in scare tactics in the Orthodox Jewish Community to try to spook any potential buyer, and, most importantly, that they can live in this property rent free over the summer.

The problem -- the immediate problem of a potential buyer is that the buyer -- that a potential buyer will force them to leave. And, you know, it's their intention to just keep freeloading. And that's essentially been the long and short of this entire case. And it's just -- in equitable. And I think there's many different ways you can -- as part of the contempt prong that we've asked for, which they have now essentially pleaded poverty --

THE COURT: Well, Your Honor, I would have to have a hearing on that. I can't hold somebody in contempt of they say, I can't afford to pay. There are obviously other remedies. But --

MR. CARLEBACH: I understand. So even -- I think even without contempt, I think there's enough latitude in the Code, especially based on the immediate surrender provisions of Section 365 by rejection of a lease, which allow you to order

```
an immediate surrender of the premises, I mean, this is really
1
   just --
2
            THE COURT: And what happens if they don't surrender
3
   it? U.S. Marshals have to go up there and take the property?
4
            MR. CARLEBACH: That's exactly what we're going to do,
5
   Judge.
6
            THE COURT:
                        Okay.
7
            MR. CARLEBACH: At whatever cost so that we can show
8
   the property and do what we need to do. And, you know, if we
9
   can get that, I think we've come a long way.
10
            In terms of the administrative expense status
11
   argument, you know, where --
12
            THE COURT: You know, it's unnecessary. You already
1.3
   have an order directing them to make a payment.
            MR. CARLEBACH: I agree. And, I mean, that's -- I
15
   think that's really what's most important today is that the
16
   Court enter that type of an order so that we can move forward
17
   with this, as opposed to just, you know, going to stage two of
18
   delaying our -- my client's rights from being exercised of, you
19
   know, for the past three years.
20
            THE COURT: Okay.
21
            MR. KRINSKY: Your Honor, Scott Krinsky, Backenroth
22
   Frankel, for the debtor.
23
            The order to show cause says nothing in the papers,
24
```

the initial papers, about this sort of relief. They just

wanted a lifting of the stay.

THE COURT: Well, but you're there and you're not paying for it. What's he supposed to do?

MR. KRINSKY: He's talking about something completely different. He's talking about a surrender of the property.

We consent to the lifting of the stay. We don't consent to a surrender of the property. There's nothing in the initial papers. Your Honor wrote intelligent --

THE COURT: They're not asking for your consent to the surrender. He's asking for an order directing you to vacate the property.

MR. KRINSKY: Right. But Your Honor wrote intelligent that you can't raise new issues in reply papers. That's basically what they did. Those reply papers were filed last night at twelve o'clock for the very first time.

If Your Honor even considers that -- and, also, in your --

THE COURT: So should I adjourn this for ten days and then consider it?

MR. KRINSKY: Well, Your Honor, in your initial order to show cause, you did not allow for reply papers. So, in essence, there's a Court order which doesn't even consider that.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. CARLEBACH: Your Honor, and reply papers are

And, like I said, this advertisement put in by the debtor is on the very day that the order to show cause was served. On May 16th, the day that the debtors' counsel received the order to show cause pursuant to the order, on that very same day, they take out an advertisement in the community saying, don't go out and -- anybody who wants to purchase the property call us, because we're going to lose money.

So, clearly, their strategy of consenting to the lift stay, but scaring off the community from -- and where they put into place a mechanism, that's sort of new to us as well, and I think it's appropriate to bring it to the Court's attention under the circumstances.

And, you know, every day that goes by is just another day that they're living in this property rent free. And it's just inequitable. It's not something that this Court should countenance.

MR. KRINSKY: Your Honor, a couple of things. One, we told them months ago we'd agree to the lifting of the stay. So that's nothing new. It's not in the papers, but just so you know in terms of background.

Second thing is that all that advertisement says is that we have an interest in the property, which we legally do have an interest in the property. We don't know how they're marketing the property. They may very well be saying we have

no interest in the property.

THE COURT: But how can you consent to a lifting of the automatic stay so they can essentially evict you, and still argue that you have an interest in the property? What's the interest?

MR. KRINSKY: Our interest is the same. We're basically saying, they want to change the playing field, which is fine. We consent to them changing the playing field.

That's --

THE COURT: So you're saying they should go to State Court now, and you'll fight them out on the merits?

MR. KRINSKY: I don't know if we will or we won't.

But, for now, we don't want to bother the Court. We will

consent to the lifting of the stay for them to litigate this

issue in State Court, which is what we assumed the purpose of

the lift-stay motion.

Again, the initial papers only say the lifting of the stay. It was assumed by anyone reading that, that that means we will lift the stay to litigate this issue in State Court.

THE COURT: That's what lifting the stay normally means.

MR. CARLEBACH: I understand, Judge. And I'm asking the -- but, at the same time, as I said, by rejection of a lease in Bankruptcy Court, the Code clearly uses the language, "immediate surrender."

```
THE COURT: But this isn't the rejection of a lease.
1
   This is a relief from stay motion.
2
            MR. CARLEBACH: I understand.
3
            THE COURT: I don't even remember anymore what's the
4
   basis of their possession of the property. But, you know,
5
   normally, when you make a motion for relief from stay, it's to
6
   proceed in another court because you can always proceed in this
7
   court without a motion for relief from the stay.
8
            And what you're really doing is you're converting this
9
   to a motion to convict them.
10
            MR. CARLEBACH: Again, Judge, you know, like I said,
11
   there are additional prongs to this motion. I know the Court
12
   doesn't necessarily want to go into the contempt today. But --
13
            THE COURT: Well, there's a factual issue. If you
14
   want to proceed with that, I'll schedule a hearing. They're
15
   saying they don't have the money to pay it.
16
            MR. CARLEBACH: Well, what I'm saying is that --
17
            THE COURT: Don't you have a judgment?
18
                             Judgment on what?
            MR. CARLEBACH:
19
20
            THE COURT: On the unpaid -- what do you call it?
   the unpaid --
21
            MR. CARLEBACH: Adequate protection amount?
22
23
            THE COURT: Yeah.
            MR. CARLEBACH: We don't have a judgment. We just
24
   have an order that --
25
```

THE COURT: I thought I gave you a -- I thought I 1 entered a money judgment. 2 MR. CARLEBACH: No. Well, that's one of the relief 3 we're seeking, Judge, is the entry of a judgment. 4 THE COURT: I thought I did that for the past-due 5 amounts. 6 MR. CARLEBACH: I don't believe so, Your Honor. 7 MR. KRINSKY: Your Honor, you gave us a certain period 8 of time to pay the past-due amounts. 9 MR. CARLEBACH: Yeah. There is another payment coming 10 through -- coming due at the end of this week for an additional 205 -- for \$210,000. 12 THE COURT: Who are the other creditors in this case? 1.3 MR. KRINSKY: Your Honor, off the top of my head, I 14 know there were various other creditors; I think a 15 communications entity, SOS, I don't have the petition in front 16 of me. But there were other creditor claims. 17 MR. CARLEBACH: There are about four or five other 18 creditors, Judge. There was a refrigeration, communications, 19 various trade creditors that apparently put money into the 2.0 debtor pre-petition in order to --21 THE COURT: What's going to happen in this case? 22 MR. CARLEBACH: Well, what we'd like to do, Judge, and 23 this goes towards the status conference, the debtor has a --

the debtor asked for more time at the last hearing, status

conference, I forget which one, to put in a plan. The Court gave them until May 15th. They didn't put in a plan.

We would like to put in a plan, Your Honor, Judge, which we will do our -- there are --

THE COURT: There's a lot of administrative debt in this case. They ran up a large fee, I'm sure, litigating that Orseck issue.

MR. CARLEBACH: Well, Judge, there are -- we also believe we have at least a three-million-dollar administrative claim based on the \$1,500 a day.

THE COURT: Okay. But you can deal with your own administrative claim in your plan by deferring it. But you have to pay the administrative claims in full on the effective date in order to confirm, which means, essentially, you're going to have to pay their legal fees, whatever the allowed amount of their legal fees turn out to be. But I'm sure they ran up a lot of money litigating with Orseck. And that wasn't their fault.

MR. CARLEBACH: Judge, there may be other avenues of recovery in this case. There are alter-ego theories that we'd like to pursue. And, you know, I think we'd like to give it a shot, certainly.

There are other assets in the case.

THE COURT: I understand that. But if you file a plan and the plan retains for the debtor, or says that the debtor is

going to assert these claims in order to recover money for the creditors, you still have to pay their legal fee on the effective date because that's what it's going to take to confirm a plan. You have to pay all administrative claims, or at least reserve for them on the effective date. And that's the obstacle you may have in proposing a plan.

I mean, I think, and I suggested this a couple of months ago, is the case be dismissed and you just pursue them. You're going to have a money judgment, which you can always pursue on an alter-ego theory.

The case is -- you know, the case isn't going anywhere in bankruptcy. They're not going to confirm a plan, from what I can tell. And your alternatives are to dismiss the case, convert the case. Obviously, you can file your own plan, but it sounds like it's going to take a lot of money to confirm the case on the effective date.

So I think you have to really think about an end game strategy for this case; otherwise, we're just going to kind of bounce along over the next couple of years with these issues that have to be decided.

MR. CARLEBACH: Well, one of the issues that are out there, which we've discussed with the Court before, is the motion for summary judgment, which we had wanted that the Court determine that. And one of my purposes --

THE COURT: Is that the one with the tax map

designation?

MR. CARLEBACH: The tax map designation, assignability of the fraud. See, the problem is, Judge, these are --

THE COURT: I'll determine that. I'm just -- that's just another issue that's not going to get you where you want to be, anyway.

MR. CARLEBACH: Well, in the sense that -- to the extent that they want to go into State Court and play with this thing further, I think it's very important that we have those determinations right here, as opposed to them starting from the ground up in State Court with a new State Court judge, and just raising all these issues and dragging this thing out interminably.

So one of the things I wanted to ask for, the Court is -- there was already a motion for summary judgment made, or Local Rule -- there were fifty-six statements were put in. There were, really, I think, three to four issues which were isolated that the Court, on July 20th, 2005, had indicated further briefing. And there was, again, the assignability of the fraud issue was only raised on reply.

One of the things I'd like to do today is set down a briefing schedule where we can submit our additional briefs and the Court will essentially deem those briefs as being initial briefs, and curing any deficiency, any pleading deficiency of having had them originally raised --

```
THE COURT: So why don't you just make the motion all
1
   over? That's really what you're saying.
2
            MR. CARLEBACH: Well, I could do that --
3
            THE COURT: You can use what you have, and it's not
4
   going to affect the timing of the motion.
5
            MR. CARLEBACH: I had thought that the Court had sort
6
   of wanted to save us that. But that's fine.
7
            THE COURT: Well, what's involved in renewing the
8
            It's the same factual material.
   motion?
9
            MR. CARLEBACH: That's fine. That's fine.
10
            THE COURT: And you're talking about briefing it.
                                                                So
11
   you can do that.
12
            MR. CARLEBACH: We'll make that motion.
13
            And I would also like to submit a judgment to the
14
   Court on both the adequate protection payment that they've
15
   missed for May, and by the end of the week, they're going to be
16
   in default on the --
17
            THE COURT: Well, okay. Are you going to submit a
18
   judgment every month?
19
20
            MR. CARLEBACH: Well, again, on the 13,000 -- well,
   there's a two-hundred-thousand-dollar payment coming due on May
21
   27th, which they've clearly indicated they're not making.
22
23
            MR. KRINSKY: Yeah, but that gets kicked to the 29th,
   just so you know, Your Honor.
            THE COURT: All right.
25
```

```
MR. CARLEBACH: And -- to the 29th. And I think I'll
1
   wait until the 29th comes and goes. If there's a check -- if
2
   we get a check in hand, I'll be happy not to submit that,
3
   Judge.
4
            THE COURT: But don't you have a judgment already? Or
5
   you can submit a judgment for a few hundred thousand dollars at
6
   this point based on the -- what was ordered on July 20th, 2005.
7
   I thought I had --
8
            MR. KRINSKY: Right. And you subsequently entered an
9
   order on April 25th, which basically gave us -- basically gave
10
   us, I think, thirty days to come up with that bigger sum of
11
   money.
12
            THE COURT: Did it say what happened if you didn't?
13
            MR. KRINSKY: It did not.
14
            THE COURT: Is there any reason why they shouldn't be
15
   able to enter a judgment for that amount?
16
            MR. KRINSKY: I think the order in and of itself is
17
   sufficient. I don't see any reason to --
18
                        Well, but they want to file a judgment.
            THE COURT:
19
   It will be a lien on the property to the extent you assert an
20
   interest in it and try and sell it. I mean, there are a lot of
21
   reasons why they would want to have a judgment to file up in
23
   the County.
            MR. KRINSKY: I'm not sure they don't have -- get to
24
```

the same place with the order.

THE COURT: So you have no objection, since they have it already. Is that what you're saying?

MR. KRINSKY: Well, we -- it's speculative and premature at this point. Our time to comply doesn't run until May 29th.

THE COURT: All right. Why don't you do this? If they don't pay you, settle a proposed judgment on ten days' notice certifying that they haven't paid. And if you have any objections to the entry of the judgment, we can take care of that.

Let me deal with today's motions. The portion of the motion that seeks an administrative claim doesn't really get us anywhere. First of all, there's an existing order which requires them to make a payment every month. It's an adequate protection payment.

In addition, if it were purely an administrative claim, I'd say, well, they'll pay you at the time of the confirmation. So I'm going to deny that motion. Really, you have that relief already in the form of an adequate protection payment.

With respect to the contempt, if you want to pursue that, I'll have to schedule a hearing because they're saying they're unable to pay. But I'll give you a chance to think about that and discuss it with your clients.

MR. CARLEBACH: Okay.

1.3

motion, I'll grant the relief to stay on consent, but Mr.

Krinsky is right. Your order didn't -- your motion didn't request that I direct them to vacate the property. And I'm not so sure that that's an appropriate relief in the context of a relief-from-stay motion. Generally, a relief-from-stay motion sends the parties back to their remedies in another court. As I said, if you think there's a basis under bankruptcy law to cause them to vacate the property, you don't have to make a relief-from-stay motion. You just bring a proceeding to require them to vacate the property. I don't know if there is such a basis to do that.

With respect to the summary judgment motion, it probably makes sense to renew it at this point. You want to add additional briefing, anyway, so you can just do it all at one time.

My recollection is that, I think it's  $\underline{\text{Fox v.}}$  Rothschild is the Appellate Division case --

MR. KRINSKY: Well, again, Your Honor, those are issues --

THE COURT: -- and then there's a Second Circuit case which cites it with approval which has a French title, Bank something or other, which basically says that in the absence of some explicit agreement, the fraud claim doesn't go to the transferee. But, you know, if you want to brief that issue, go

```
ahead.
1
            MR. CARLEBACH: Okay.
2
            THE COURT: All right? So you can -- what do you want
3
   to do with your contempt? Do you want to think about it?
4
            MR. CARLEBACH: I want to think about the contempt,
5
   yes.
6
            THE COURT: All right. If you want to put that on for
7
   a hearing, let chambers know and we'll have a telephonic
8
   conference to schedule a hearing on that.
9
            You can settle an order granting relief from the
10
   automatic stay denying the motion with respect to the
11
   administrative claim for the reasons stated on the record, and
12
   just make your motion for summary judgment. Make it promptly,
13
   because I think this case is on a short string.
            MR. KRINSKY: Your Honor, are we getting to a briefing
15
   schedule on summary judgment today, or is that a --
16
            MR. CARLEBACH: Well, I'll make the motion, and --
17
            THE COURT: Why don't you discuss it? I think most of
18
   this is briefed.
19
20
            MR. KRINSKY: I would not necessarily agree with that,
   Your Honor.
21
            THE COURT: Okay. And, as I said, you've got to think
22
23
   about, you know, where you're going with this case.
            MR. CARLEBACH: Okay. And if there is -- I would like
24
```

to look at the issue of if there is a basis under the

```
Bankruptcy Code for Your Honor to order an immediate surrender,
1
   I'd like to renew that.
2
            THE COURT: You can always renew that.
3
            MR. CARLEBACH: Yeah. Okay.
4
            THE COURT: I just don't think that the relief-from-
5
   stay motion does that.
6
            MR. CARLEBACH: Okay.
7
            THE COURT: Okay?
8
            MR. CARLEBACH: Thank you.
9
            MR. KRINSKY: Your Honor, thank you for your time.
10
            THE COURT: Thanks. Let me give you another date for
11
   the status conference. I'm sure I'll see you before then, but
12
   how about June 26th?
13
            MR. CARLEBACH: I think I have an argument in the
14
   Second Circuit on the 26th.
15
            THE COURT: Why don't you do this? Are you going to
16
   make your motion soon?
17
            MR. CARLEBACH: Yes.
18
            THE COURT: All right. Why don't -- whatever return
19
   date you select for the motion, ask my deputy to adjourn the
20
   status conference to that date also.
21
            MR. CARLEBACH: Okay.
22
23
            THE COURT: Okay?
            MR. KRINSKY: Your Honor, thank you.
24
            THE COURT: Okay, thanks.
25
```